

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	CRIM. NO. 1:19-CR-251
	:	
v.	:	(Judge Rambo)
	:	
	:	(Magistrate Judge Carlson)
ADAM NEFTALI SANTANA	:	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

I. Introduction

This case comes before us for consideration of a motion for temporary release of the defendant filed pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), which provides that:

The judicial officer may, . . . , permit the temporary release of the person, in the custody of a United States marshal or another appropriate person, to the extent that the judicial officer determines such release to be necessary for preparation of the person’s defense or for another compelling reason.

18 U.S.C. § 3142 (i).

In the instant case, the “compelling reason” which the defendant asserts justifies the defendant’s temporary release from pre-trial detention is the COVID-19 pandemic that is sweeping the nation, and the dangers of infection which may result from close confinement in a custodial setting. This motion is fully briefed by the parties, and we have afforded all parties the opportunity to make evidentiary presentations in support of their respective positions regarding temporary release for the defendant. Therefore, this motion is ripe for resolution.

We acknowledge the gravity of the defendant's concerns, which are shared by all Americans as this nation faces a pandemic without precedent in the past century of our nation's history. In addressing the instant motion, we must assess these individual medical concerns, apply the legal benchmarks mandated by Congress, and weigh these concerns against the important societal interests promoted by the Bail Reform Act, which calls for the detention of those defendants who present a danger to the community. Having conducted an individualized assessment of the facts and circumstances presented in this case, for the reasons set forth below it is ordered that the motion for temporary release is DENIED without prejudice to the defendant filing a new motion for reconsideration, should his circumstances materially change.

II. Factual Background and Procedural History

On August 28, 2019, the defendant was charged with conspiracy to distribute and possess with intent to distribute cocaine hydrochloride, attempted possession with intent to distribute cocaine hydrochloride, and possession of a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 and 18 U.S.C. § 924(c). Following the defendant's arrest, the United States moved pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142 to detain the defendant pending trial. Initial proceedings and a detention hearing were then conducted in this case on September 5, 2019.

At the time of these initial proceedings, the probation office prepared a comprehensive pre-trial services report, which provided the following information concerning the defendant's social and medical history, prior history of substance abuse, and criminal record: the defendant has a history of substance abuse evidenced by prior charges for driving under the influence and possession with intent to deliver a controlled substance. The pre-trial services report also recommended the defendant's detention based upon a careful evaluation of the following individual characteristics of the defendant: his criminal history, the current pending charge for drug trafficking, and his previous denial of bail in his local Franklin County case for possession with intent to deliver a controlled substance.

Following a hearing, we ordered the defendant detained pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142, finding that the defendant presented a risk of flight and danger to the community, and that there was no condition or combinations of conditions which could assure the safety of the community or the defendant's appearance in court as required. On this score, we specifically found that the defendant had not rebutted the presumption in favor of detention against him, and ordered detention on this basis.

The instant motion for temporary release does not focus upon or directly challenge any of these initial detention findings or determinations. Instead, the defendant's motion for release rests upon a concern shared by all: the risk of infection due to the current coronavirus pandemic. As the defendant notes, this risk

of community spread is heightened in a custodial setting, where the very nature of confinement limits the ability of individuals to engage in the type of social isolation that is recommended to curb the spread of this disease.

In addition to this generalized concern, the defendant cites the following specific and individualized factors which heighten these medical concerns in the instant case: his severe persistent asthma and sleep apnea. To treat these conditions, the defendant has been prescribed a Ventolin inhaler with direction to take two puffs every four hours as needed, Brio Ellipta with direction to take one puff once a day, and Zyrtec with direction to take one tablet each day. In addition, the defendant was prescribed a CPAP machine for his sleep apnea. Before his incarceration, the defendant's recent medical records reveal that he has suffered from asthma since he was 7 years old and routinely sees specialists and physicians to attempt to better manage this condition. He is not able to take corticosteroids, the typical treatment for individuals with asthma, and was using an Albuterol Sulfate nebulizer with direction to inhale every four hours as needed, and Nasonex spray with two sprays per day before his incarceration. It appears as though the defendant's asthma is well managed with his current medications.

The Government, in turn, opposes this motion, arguing that the defendant remains a flight risk and a danger to the community based on his criminal history and the presumptions in place which caused us to order the defendant detained in the

first instance. Specifically, the government points out that the defendant ran from law enforcement when he was first apprehended and faces a lengthy period of detention upon sentencing which could exacerbate this pre-existing risk of flight.

III. Discussion

A. Temporary Release Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142

While cast as a motion seeking temporary release under 18 U.S.C. § 3142 (i), this motion is best understood and evaluated in the context of the Bail Reform Act as a whole. In the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3141, *et seq.*, Congress created a comprehensive set of statutory guidelines governing release and detention decisions for criminal cases in federal court. As one court has recently observed:

Before this Court can turn to the analysis under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), it is essential to look at the overarching structure of the statute. The fundamental precept of the Bail Reform Act mandates the release of individuals so long as the court can be reasonably assured the defendant does not pose a flight risk or danger to the community. 18 U.S.C. § 3142. To the extent that conditions, or a combination of conditions, can be fashioned to reasonably provide such assurances, the individual must be released, as detention is “the carefully limited exception.” *Id.*; see also United States v. Salerno, 481 U.S. 739, 755 (1987).

In assessing what conditions, if any, can be fashioned, judges are directed to take into account available information pertaining to the factors identified under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g). Those factors include the nature and circumstances of the offense charged, including whether it involves controlled substances or firearms; the weight of the evidence against the defendant; the defendant’s history and characteristics (including history relating to drug abuse, defendant’s criminal history, and record of appearing at court proceedings); whether the detainee was on probation, parole, or other court supervision at the time of the allegedly offensive conduct; and the nature and seriousness of the

danger to any person or the community posed by the defendant's release. 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g). Ultimately, the information provided in each case aids in the individualized assessment that will result in the release or the detention of the person.

United States of America v. Cox, 2020 WL 1491180, *2 (D. Nev. Mar. 27, 2020).

Beyond this individualized assessment mandated by law, the Bail Reform Act also enjoins us to weigh release and detention decisions against a series of statutory presumptions. Principal among these presumptions which guide us in this custodial calculus are a series of statutory presumptions in favor of detention for defendants charged with violent crimes, serious drug trafficking offenses, or crimes involving the sexual exploitation of the most vulnerable in society, our children. As to these defendants, “[s]ubject to rebuttal by the person, it shall be presumed that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of the community if the judicial officer finds that there is probable cause to believe that the person committed,” one of these enumerated offenses. 18 U.S.C. § 3142 (e)(3). In this regard, it is also well-settled that an “indictment [charging an enumerated offense] is sufficient to support a finding of probable cause triggering the rebuttable presumption of dangerousness under § 3142(e).” United States v. Suppa, 799 F.2d 115, 119 (3d Cir. 1986).

Cast against this comprehensive statutory scheme prescribing the procedure for making initial bail and detention decisions, § 3142(i) constitutes a limited safety valve provision, enabling courts to re-examine detention decisions “to the extent that

the judicial officer determines such release to be necessary for preparation of the person's defense or for another compelling reason.” 18 U.S.C. § 3142 (i). Until recently, there was a relative paucity of case law construing for us what would constitute a “compelling reason” justifying the temporary release of a previously detained defendant. Of late, however, a rising tide of case law has construed the meaning and reach of § 3142(i) in the context of continuing custody decisions in the age of coronavirus.

From these cases a few guiding principles have emerged. First, the very nature of the standard prescribed by statute—which requires a showing of some “compelling reason” to warrant temporary release from custody—suggests that such motions must meet exacting standards and “the few courts that have ordered temporary release on the basis of such a condition have done so only ‘sparingly’ and typically in order ‘to permit a defendant’s release where, for example, he is suffering from a terminal illness or serious injuries[,]’ ” United States of America v. Lee, No. 19-CR-298 (KBJ), 2020 WL 1541049, at *3 (D.D.C. Mar. 30, 2020) (quoting United States v. Hamilton, No. 19-CR-54-01, 2020 WL 1323036, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 20, 2020)).

Second, like the initial decision to detain, a determination of whether a movant has shown compelling reasons justifying temporary release is an individualized judgment which takes into account the unique circumstances of each case and each

defendant. Thus, courts have allowed for temporary release where a defendant's specific circumstances presented a compelling and immediate need for release. For example, release of a defendant is permitted under § 3142(i) when that defendant is suffering from a terminal illness or serious injuries. See, e.g., United States v. Scarpa, 815 F. Supp. 88 (E.D.N.Y. 1993) (permitting release of defendant suffering from terminal AIDS that could no longer be managed by correctional authorities); see also United States v. Cordero Caraballo, 185 F. Supp. 2d 143 (D.P.R. 2002) (permitting release where defendant sustained "serious" and "grotesque" gunshot wounds, suffered a heart attack, underwent an emergency tracheotomy, was partially paralyzed, could not use his hands, and had open and infected wounds about his body, and where the United States Marshal's Service reused to take custody of him until his wounds closed).

There is a necessary corollary to this principle, calling for an individualized and specific showing of a compelling reason to satisfy the movant's burden of proof under § 3142(i). Cases construing § 3142(i) generally "have rejected emergency motions for release of otherwise healthy and potentially violent defendants based solely on the generalized risks that COVID-19 admittedly creates for all members of our society." United States v. Lee, No. 19-CR-298 (KBJ), 2020 WL 1541049, at *6 (D.D.C. Mar. 30, 2020) (citing United States v. Cox, No. 19-cr-271, 2020 WL 1491180 (D. Nev. Mar. 27, 2020)); United States v. Green, No. 19-cr-304, 2020 WL

1477679 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 26, 2020); United States v. Steward, No. 20-cr-52, 2020 WL 1468005 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 26, 2020); United States v. Hamilton, No. 19-cr-54, 2020 WL 1323036 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 20, 2020); see also United States v. Clark, No. 19-40068-01-HLT, 2020 WL 1446895, at *3 (D. Kan. Mar. 25, 2020). Rather, at a minimum courts have typically required proof of a “[d]efendant’s particular vulnerability to the disease [in order to] constitute a compelling reason for release under § 3142(i).” United States of Am. v. Keith Kennedy, No. 18-20315, 2020 WL 1493481, at *4 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 27, 2020), reconsideration denied sub nom. United States v. Kennedy, No. 18-20315, 2020 WL 1547878 (E.D. Mich. Apr. 1, 2020).

The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has very recently underscored for us the necessity of a more particularized showing of a compelling need for release beyond proof of the generalized risks posed by COVID-19 when a prisoner seeks release from jail. Addressing this question in another custodial setting, petitions for compassionate release from custody, the court of appeals stated in terms that are equally applicable here that:

We do not mean to minimize the risks that COVID-19 poses in the . . . prison system, particularly for inmates But the mere existence of COVID-19 in society and the possibility that it may spread to a particular prison alone cannot independently justify . . . release.

United States of America v. Raia, No. 20-1033, 2020 WL 1647922, at *2 (3d Cir. Apr. 2, 2020).

Finally, any determination of whether a movant has established compelling reasons which now warrant temporary release from custody must take into account the important considerations of public safety and flight which animated the original decision to detain the offender pending trial. Thus, “in considering the propriety of temporary release, the court would need to balance the reasons advanced for such release against the risks that were previously identified and resulted in an order of detention.” United States of America v. Cox, 2020 WL 1491180, *2 (D. Nev. Mar. 27, 2020). In practice, therefore, a decision on a motion seeking release under § 3142(i) entails an informed judgment assessing both individual health concerns and broader public safety interests. In reaching these judgments the court must:

[E]valuate at least the following factors: (1) the original grounds for the defendant’s pretrial detention, (2) the specificity of the defendant’s stated COVID-19 concerns, (3) the extent to which the proposed release plan is tailored to mitigate or exacerbate other COVID-19 risks to the defendant, and (4) the likelihood that the defendant’s proposed release would increase COVID-19 risks to others. The court will not necessarily weigh these factors equally, but will consider them as a whole to help guide the court’s determination as to whether a “compelling reason” exists such that temporary release is “necessary.”
§ 3142(i)

United States v. Clark, No. 19-40068-01-HLT, 2020 WL 1446895, at *3 (D. Kan. Mar. 25, 2020).

It is against this statutory backdrop that we evaluate the instant request for temporary release from custody.

B. The Defendant's Motion for Temporary Release Will Be Denied Without Prejudice.

Our analysis of this motion begins with the proposition that “[w]hile the COVID-19 pandemic has given rise to exceptional and exigent circumstances that require the prompt attention of the courts, it is imperative that they continue to carefully and impartially apply the proper legal standards that govern each individual’s particular request for relief.” United States v. Roeder, No. 20-1682, 2020 WL 1545872, at *3 (3d Cir. Apr. 1, 2020). In this case, our careful and impartial application of the legal standards mandated by § 3142(i), requires us to assess both the public safety grounds for the defendant’s initial detention as well as: (1) the specificity of the defendant’s stated COVID-19 concerns; (2) the extent to which the proposed release plan is tailored to mitigate or exacerbate other COVID-19 risks to the defendant; and (3) the likelihood that the defendant’s proposed release would increase COVID-19 risks to others.

Turning first to an individualized evaluation of the defendant’s COVID-19 concerns, our assessment begins with a recognition of the unprecedented health care crisis presented by the coronavirus pandemic. However, it is clear that under § 3142(i), we cannot grant release of a defendant previously deemed to be a danger to public safety or a risk of flight “based solely on the generalized risks that COVID-19 admittedly creates for all members of our society.” United States v. Lee, No. 19-CR-298 (KBJ), 2020 WL 1541049, at *6 (D.D.C. Mar. 30, 2020). In this case,

beyond a genuine, but generalized, concern regarding the risks created by COVID-19, the defendant alleges that he suffers from severe persistent asthma and sleep apnea. To treat these conditions, the defendant has been prescribed a Ventolin inhaler, Brio Ellipta, and Zyrtec. In addition, the defendant suffers from sleep apnea. The defendant's recent medical records reveal that he has suffered from asthma since he was 7 years old and routinely sees specialists and physicians to attempt to better manage this condition. He is not able to take corticosteroids, the typical treatment for individuals with asthma, and was using an Albuterol Sulfate nebulizer with direction to inhale every four hours as needed, and Nasonex spray with two sprays per day before his incarceration. It appears as though the defendant's asthma is relatively well managed with his current medications.

We must then weigh those specific health concerns against the substantial public safety considerations which led us to order the defendant's detention in the first instance. In this case, the following factors, unique to the defendant, compelled the decision to detain the defendant as a risk of flight and danger to the community: his criminal history, his pattern of substance abuse and drug trafficking, his denial of bail in his local Franklin County case for possession with intent to deliver a controlled substance, his gun ownership in connection with drug trafficking, and the fact that he ran when law enforcement attempted to apprehend him for the current charges.

In addition, we are mindful of a number of recent cases from district courts tasked with ruling on motions for pre-trial detention reconsideration that have denied release despite those defendants having health conditions that are similar, and often more severe, than those presented in this case. See, e.g., United States v. Christian, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60103 (D. Md. Apr. 6, 2020) (denying temporary release on grounds of underlying asthma diagnosis); United States v. Tucker, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59516 (D. Md. Apr. 3, 2020) (collecting cases) (severe asthma, high blood pressure and high cholesterol insufficient to justify temporary release); United States v. Pritchett, CR 19-280, 2020 WL 1640280, *3 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 2, 2020) (asthma diagnosis insufficient to grant temporary release); United States v. Crosby, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58189 (D. Md. Apr. 2, 2020) (previous diagnosis of pneumonia, asthma, and a need for an albuterol inhaler insufficient to allow temporary release); United States v. Jones, 2:19-CR-00249-DWA, 2020 WL 1511221, *3 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 29, 2020) (hypertension, sleep apnea, and asthma were not sufficient to grant temporary release); United States v. Gileno, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47590 (D. Conn. Mar. 19, 2020) (high blood pressure, high cholesterol, asthma, and allergies insufficient to allow temporary release). Indeed, of the courts to consider instances where the defendant suffers from asthma, sleep apnea, or other medical conditions, only a select few have granted temporary release despite the fact that all have recognized the risks associated with moderate to severe pulmonary conditions in

light of the COVID-19 pandemic. Thus, the rising tide of current case law suggests that a diagnosis of asthma which is controlled through medication, standing alone, will not provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption in favor of pretrial detention that exists when a defendant is indicted for serious and significant drug trafficking offenses like those pending against the defendant in this case.

IV. Conclusion

Weighing and balancing these countervailing considerations we conclude that the defendant has not overcome the presumption in place in favor of his pre-trial detention. We reiterate that the defendant poses a serious risk to the community if he were released and an equally serious risk to law enforcement, should they need to re-apprehend him if he decided to flee. We also note the rising tide of cases that have denied temporary release, particularly in instances where there are no confirmed cases of COVID-19 in the prison where the defendant is being housed and where the correctional facility has measures in place to try to prevent the spread of this novel virus. Such is the case here. The United States Marshals Service reports that each of the contracted detention facilities it uses to house pre-trial detainees are implementing guidance from the Centers for Disease Control in an ongoing effort to provide for inmate safety and to mitigate the risk of spread should an infection occur. As of March 30, 2020, these county facilities reported no positive COVID-19 cases

among their inmate populations. Thus, to date, institutional efforts to mitigate exposure to this virus have been successful.¹

Based upon these findings, the defendant's motion for temporary release pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i) will be DENIED without prejudice to renewal if the defendant's circumstances should materially change. An appropriate order follows.

So ordered this 7th day of April 2020.

/s/ Martin C. Carlson
Martin C. Carlson
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ We note that the reply brief filed by Santana invites us to consider what the defendant alleges are Government practices regarding the release and detention of cooperating defendants in determining whether to release this defendant. Because we are enjoined that: "it is imperative . . . to carefully and impartially apply the proper legal standards that govern *each individual's particular request for relief*," United States v. Roeder, No. 20-1682, 2020 WL 1545872, at *3 (3d Cir. Apr. 1, 2020) (emphasis added), we will decline this invitation to release the defendant based upon a claim of disparate treatment of other unnamed, unidentified and hypothetical persons. Instead, focusing on the particular circumstances of this defendant, as we must, we conclude that release is not warranted under § 3142(i).

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	CRIM. NO. 19-CR-251
	:	
v.	:	(Judge Rambo)
	:	
	:	(Magistrate Judge Carlson)
ADAM NEFTALI SANTANA	:	

ORDER

In accordance with the accompanying Memorandum Opinion, the defendant’s motion for temporary release pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i) is DENIED. “Because the Court is mindful that both the conditions in . . . jail and the COVID-19 pandemic itself are both rapidly evolving, it will entertain a renewed request for release if—at some point in the future—it becomes clear” that there are compelling reasons that justify the defendant’s release. United States of America v. Lee, No. 19-CR-298 (KBJ), 2020 WL 1541049, at *7 (D.D.C. Mar. 30, 2020). Therefore, this order is entered without prejudice to renewal of this motion at some future date should the defendant’s circumstances materially change.

So ordered this 7th day of April 2020.

/s/ Martin C. Carlson
Martin C. Carlson
United States Magistrate Judge